

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed February 8, 2012.

Applicant's amendment and remarks have been carefully considered.

2. Claim 1, 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 2003/0042097) in view of Martin (US 4,856,738) and Smith (US 4,713,497).

Lee discloses a cable system having features similar to that recited in the instant claims, including a row of seats 10, multi-conductor cable 18, first and second connectors 34, 42, and cable storage unit 14 comprising housing 26 and reel 22. It is noted that Lee does not show a second row of seats being adjustable between first and second selectable configurations.

Martin discloses an aircraft, wherein there are multiple rows of seats that are adjustable to accommodate varying passenger capacities.

In view of Martin, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the seat arrangement of Lee a plurality of rows of seats that are adjustable, in a manner similar to that taught by Martin, to accommodate varying passenger capacities.

Regarding the cable being manually coiled or manually uncoiled, as recited in instant claim 1, consider the structure of Smith, Figs. 6 and 7, wherein the cable storage device may be optionally made for manual operation. In view of Smith, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to alternatively make the cable storage device of Lee for manual operation so as to avoid the need for a biasing spring that may

Art Unit: 3617

loose its capability overtime.

Regarding the instant claimed limitation relating to the cable length, note that the cable length of Lee is considered to be suitable for the use by a person on the seat where the cable storage device is mounted or by a person seating behind said seat.

Regarding the instant claimed housing being configured to be mounted underneath of at least one of the passenger seats, note that since the cable storage unit of Lee has a configuration that it is capable of being mounted at another location, such as underneath of at least one passenger seats, the instant claimed limitation is considered met.

As to Applicant's intention of claiming a length of cable that is long enough to extend a distance between the rows of seats, note that even if the wordings of the instant claims were amended to be more specifically in line with Applicant's intention, such feature would not be considered as patentably significant because it basically involves with generally simple tasks of (1) choosing a convenient location for mounting a cable storage device, and (2) selecting an adequate cable length to reach a nearby user. Such tasks appear to require no more than a level of common sense of one ordinary skilled in the art. Note that the placement of the cable storage device and the cable length in the original structure of Lee obviously requires such tasks, and when one of ordinary skill in the art has a desire to mount the cable storage device of Lee at another convenient location in the seat, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use his common sense to select a suitable length for the cable in the cable storage device for use by a nearby user.

Art Unit: 3617

Regarding the instant claimed type of connectors, or type of cables, as recited in instant claims 5 and 6, note that DIN connectors and Ethernet conductors are well known types of connectors and cables for use with well known electronic devices and/or computers (Official Notice is taken). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute well known a type of connectors and/or conductors, such as the well known DIN connectors and/or Ethernet conductors, for the connectors and/or conductors of Lee's structure and to configure the cable storage device of Lee so as to be more suitable to accommodate the same such that the cable storage device of Lee is suitable for use other commercially available electronic devices and/or computers that would require such well known types of connectors and/or conductors.

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant should consider for example, Milano (US 2004/0149533), para. [0074]; wherein, DIN connectors or another different type of known connectors and cables can be used in the cable storage device of Milano to configure it to be suitable with another type of electronic devices. Milano provides a clear support for the above Official notice regarding the well known cable connectors and/or conductors.

4. Responses to Applicant's Arguments:

Applicant's arguments against the above ground of rejection have been carefully considered, but are not persuasive because Lee, as modified in view of the teaching of Martin and further in view of the teaching of Smith, includes all features defined in the instant claims. To overcome the above rejection, Applicant should argue against the

Art Unit: 3617

proposed combination of Lee, Martin and Smith by either explaining how the combination of the references is improper, or the combination does not result in a structure having all of the features required by the instant claims. On the other hand, Applicant should note that the wordings in the claims that define intended uses or capabilities (such as “selectable”, “configured to”, “configured to be”, “may be”, etc.) do not carry significant patentable weights because if the prior art structure is capable of the instant claimed intended uses or capabilities, the limitations thereof are considered met.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARK LE whose telephone number is (571)272-6682. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (Teleworking).

Art Unit: 3617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samuel Morano can be reached on 571-272-6684. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Tuan Le  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3617

/Mark Tuan Le/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3617